



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/730,161

12/08/2003

Marco Serra

MDE-002C1

2317

42532 7590 09/13/2007

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

VO, HAI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/730,161	Applicant(s) SERRA ET AL.	
	Examiner Hai Vo	Art Unit 1771	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai Vo.

(3) Steven Kohen.

(2) Erik Saarma.

(4) Dr. Martimus Van schoor.

Date of Interview: 11 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bashan (US 3,900,030) and Mumick et al (US 5,969,052).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Incorporation the gel particles having hydrophobic and hydrophilic constituents into the claims to show the distinction over the prior art. Additionally, Applicant's representative will point out that the combined teachings of Bashan and Mumick are improper in achieving the claimed invention in next response. Further search is required to clarify that the hydrogel does not have any hydrophobic and hydrophilic constituents as argued by Applicant's representative.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Hai Vo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1771

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required